



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/719,481 | 11/21/2003 | Carlton Lane | MSFT-2791/303661.01 | 3629 |
| 41505 | 7590 | 04/24/2008 | | |
| WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) | | | EXAMINER | |
| CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR | | | PHAM, KHANH B | |
| 2929 ARCH STREET | | | | |
| PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2166 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/24/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/719,481 | Applicant(s) LANE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Khanh B. Pham | Art Unit 2166 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Khanh B. Pham, Examiner. (3) Pedro Hernandez, Applicant's representative.
 (2) Kenneth Eiferman, Applicant's representative. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 22 April 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,9,17 and 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lurie (2002/0116698) and Glaser (5,953,525).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discuss proposed amendment to claims 1, 9, 17 and 22. Applicant argued that the combination of Lurie and Glaser does not teach the newly added limitations. The examiner agreed to consider the amendment upon filing of the official amendment. Further search and consideration are required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Khanh B. Pham/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2166

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required